IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.185 OF 2006

Rajeev Shukla) ...Applicant

Vs.

1. M/s.K.H.Investment)
2. State of Maharashtra) ...Respondents

Shri H.Rehman i/by Shri M.V.Kini for the Petitioner.

Shri Kedar Millwala i/by Shri Girish Kulkarni for the Respondent No.1.

Shri S.V.More, A.P.P. for the State.

CORAM : A. S. OKA, J.
DATE : OCTOBER 05, 2006.

JUDGMENT:

1. Rule. The Advocate for the first Respondent waives service. The learned A.P.P. waives service for the second Respondent. Taken up for hearing forthwith. The first Respondent has agreed to compound the offence in view of settlement between the parties. Consent terms duly signed by the Applicant, the first Respondent and their respective advocates are taken on record and marked "X" for identification. It is pointed out that the first Respondent is personally present in the court.

2. The consent terms record overall settlement

between the parties. Therefore, a case is made out for compounding the offence as provided under section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

3. Hence, rule is made absolute in terms of prayer clause (b) and the Applicant is acquitted of the offence complained against him.

4. By consent, the Applicant is permitted to withdraw a sum of Rs.50,000/- deposited by him in the Trial Court.

JUDGE